
**DCSS P3 PROJECT
NON-JUDICIAL FORMS WORKGROUP
AUGUST 22, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Tuesday, August 22, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Non-Judicial Forms Workgroup, held its third official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Bill Kirk, State Co-Leader (DCSS Data Manager)
- ☒ Pat Ratty, County Co-Leader & Small County Rep (Paralegal---Placer)
- ☒ Pamela Crandall, County Analyst (FSO Supervisor---Sonoma)
- ☒ Rita Carroll, State Analyst (DCSS System Standards Analyst)
- ☒ Kristy Johnson, State Analyst (DCSS System Standards Analyst)
- ☐ Ruth Franklin, Medium County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Santa Clara)
- ☒ Deborah Potter, Large County Rep (Analyst---Fresno)
- ☒ Robert McLeod, Advocate Rep (ACES---Legal Research)
- ☒ Jenny Skoble, Advocate Rep (Harriett Buhai Ctr---Staff Attorney)
- ☒ Ed Kent, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Lynn Johnson, FTB Rep (CCSAS Info Systems Analyst)
- ☐ Judi Bentzien, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Kathleen Cullen, Judicial Council (County Clerk---Orange)
- ☐ Kristen Hoadley, Judicial Council (San Francisco)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☐ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☒ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☐ John Schambre, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov.

Review of travel reimbursement and requirements.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Bill Kirk opened the discussion with the possibility of a new agenda.

Lynn passed out FTB tax forms development and distribution. Advocate is a go-between the agency and groups but also feels the advocate should be independent. Feels this process

may be useful in helping to establish a Forms Unit for DCSS. Discussion of how the unit is set up. Difference between FTB and DCSS is the fact that there are local agencies associated with DCSS, and FTB is a state organization. Discussion regarding size of the Unit. Suggestion that the Unit be at least as large as the FTB forms unit. We have made the recommendation that there be a forms unit and a NJC committee to review. Discussion tabled to the next meeting so we can review the handouts and come back with a recommendation.

Issue: the counties need lead time to implement a new form.

Conversion issues: Counties converting to consortia systems and then another conversion to the state system. Forms issues here are system issues, not process or implementation issues. We recommend that another group/forum discuss this issue.

We decided to come up with a step by step process for developing, distributing and implementing forms. New agenda item.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop forms policy around county specific forms. Every request for a specific form should have the opportunity to become a state form. Need review and approval/disapproval process.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Most common forms by category
 - Determine high priorities for forms
2. List of county specific forms
3. Standards for NJC forms
(CHECK BOXES?)
4. Step by step process for developing, distributing and implementing forms
5. Implementation process-homework for sub-group

D. MOST COMMON FORMS BY CATEGORY

Jenny is concerned about when we will be actually looking at the forms themselves (critical forms). The group discussed this issue. General consensus: we need to prioritize the forms first, before we can take a look at any individual forms.

Using the information Patty provided, the group discussed the Customers & Forms Categories (existing forms) and prioritized them.

- Priorities (from a customer's point of view)
 - Critical-essential form
 - Needed-but can wait
 - Nice to have

Forms rankings attached.

E. STANDARDS FOR NON-JUDICIAL FORMS

1. DCSS Letterhead
2. IV-D Local (district) office
3. Date
4. Addressee
5. Case Info
 - Case Info
 - CP
 - NCP
 - Superior Court Number
 - Bar code
 - Subject
 - SSN
 - DMV
 - Contact name
 - Contact phone number
 - Form name and revision date at bottom left
 - Case number and requester ID at bottom right
 - Where possible – one page form
 - Two-sided-tumbled
 - Multi-page “Page # of #”

F. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES

In our session, we identified the following issues for other workgroups:

- Case Processing: Use of forms once they are standardized
- Training: case management, training, client access and case processing

G. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

- None identified

H. HANDOUTS

- FTB Tax Forms Development and Distribution (Lynn)
- How a Proposal Becomes a Rule (Kristy)
- Management and Office Procedures, Chapter 23-400 Forms Management (DSS manual) (Kristy)
- Business Operations/Equipment Forms (Kristy)
- Legislation Affecting Non-Judicial Forms (Jenny)

I. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- See attached listing

- Lynn, Rita, Kristy and Ed will develop draft process for review by group for the next meeting for forms implementation.
- Bill will update agendas and email to the group
- Bill-Forward OCSE interpretation on emancipation in a IV-D case
- Bill-“involved agency” forms
- Lynn-Research CDC letter
- Review FTB forms Information and other handouts
- Subgroup draft process
- Review previous action items
- Kristy will bring copies of the 1-A forms

J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

- Continue discussion of DCSS Forms Unit at next session

K. ATTACHMENTS

- Action Item List
- Forms Ranking